From Nina: Feb. 22 p.m. only and the week of the 29th any time (BCT is that Thursday).

From Derek: I am in training the 23rd through the 25th, so won't make the City meeting this month.

I am on vacation March 1-4. I plan on talking to the BCT on Feb 9 about the March BCT meeting date. Danielle can cover for me if it needs to be on the 3rd, otherwise I was going to suggest the following week. If that date changes, I will be in SF the week of March 7. If not, my next visit is planned for the City meeting in the middle of March.

I can also make myself available via phone oevr the next two weeks, if it needs to be sooner.

Derek

From Bradley:

-----Original Message-----
From: Bradley Angel [mailto:bradley@greenaction.org]
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2016 8:52 AM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Daniel O Hirsch <dhirsch1@cruzio.com>; Marie Harrison <marieH@greenaction.org>
Subject: setting up meeting or conference call with epa, navy, dtsc about shipyard environmental studies

Hi Lily,
Thanks for offering to coordinate setting up a phone or in person meeting with EPA, Navy and DTSC (any other agencies?) to discuss the studies done on the shipyard and development.
Tuesdays and Thursdays around 4 pm are the best.
Let us know.
Participating with us would be our technical advisers from UCSC, and would probably invite a couple of other folks such as Anthony Khalil from LEJ and Ray Tompkins.

Bradley

From: Maria Caine <maria.ep.caine@gmail.com>

To: marieh@greenaction.org

Hello,

I'm sorry to be getting these questions to you almost a full week after the meeting, it's been a busy week. Here are some questions Lucien and I had that we didn't get a chance to ask.

1) Which sites are soil/debris being removed to?
2) What exposure did workers face during the removal of the sewer systems?

3) What were the levels of contamination found in the area surrounding the sewers before and after removal?
4)Will ground water be monitored in real time, continually, or by request?

Thank you again so much for having us and for hosting the meeting.

Thanks,
Maria, Lucien, and the UCSC team

From: Janice Montelongo-Acosta [mailto:janice.pma@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2016 5:17 PM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC
Subject: Questions about Final Amended Parcel B Record of Decision for Hunters Point

Greetings, I hope this email finds you well.

I am a local Bay Area community member with an inquiry concerning the radiological risk and dose calculations presented on the amended ROD for Parcel B of Hunters Point. I will be using table 7-3 on page 105 of the document as a specific reference.

The issue is that there is no clear methodology of how the risk numbers on the table were obtained. Essentially, the calculations for radiological risk do not, on the surface, make sense. Let's say one were to use the numbers pushed forward by the National Academy of Sciences to calculate radiological risk ($1.16 * 10^{-3}$ risk/rem). For the total lifetime radiological risk for building 140, for example, the calculation would be $4.4 * 10^{-4}$ risk, which is hundreds of times bigger the $1.44 * 10^{-6}$ shown on the chart. This trend follows up with other impacted buildings.

The table notes include no additional information about how the numbers were calculated. Will it be possible for you to direct me to that information, or perhaps even direct me to someone who will be able to explain these calculations? It would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward to your reply.

TABLE 7-3: RADIOLOGICAL RISK RESULTS
Parcel B Amended Record of Decision, Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, California

	RESRAD-BUILD Results	
Impacted Building	**Radiological Risk[a,b]**	**Dose (millirem/year)**
Building 103	1.48×10^{-6}	7.02
Building 113	1.48×10^{-6}	7.02
Building 113A	1.60×10^{-6}	1.45
Building 130	1.60×10^{-6}	1.45
Building 140	1.44×10^{-6}	5.43
Building 146	1.16×10^{-6}	1.20

Notes:

a Total risk and dose is equivalent to incremental risk and dose. Actual calculated dose and risk will be based on field measurements from the final status survey results. Incremental risk does not include risk from chemicals present at or below ambient levels; total risk includes risk from all chemical concentrations.

b Total excess lifetime cancer risk

--

Janice